

Editor's note

Bill Thompson
Macquarie University

In Volume 4, Number 2 of *Empirical Musicology Review*, Judith Becker (2009) described some of the frustrations of “crossing boundaries” when attempting to publish research in an interdisciplinary area such as empirical musicology. As an example, she cites a manuscript on “deep listening” that was revised and finessed numerous times after being repeatedly critiqued by anonymous reviewers on every conceivable issue. Eventually the authors withdrew their manuscript from further consideration in the original target journal. That manuscript is now published in EMR as part of an open dialogue on the difficulties of working in an interdisciplinary area (Penman & Becker, 2009). Four leading scholars provided critical reactions to the manuscript (Bailey, 2009; Clarke, 2009; Clayton, 2009; Janata, 2009).

EMR provided a perfect home for Penman and Becker’s examination of deep listening. More generally, EMR’s practice of public peer-review complements the traditional convention of anonymous peer review. Both systems depend on high quality submissions. However, public peer-review nurtures open debate and lively discussion on the most important issues that face our field, and it promotes a level of collegiality and cooperation that is not usually reflected in other journals. It provides an opportunity to share ideas and work together to solve the problems of our discipline.

In the current issue, David Huron and his colleagues present data on some aspects of performance that are rarely discussed in conservatories of music. In the first target article, Huron, Dahl and Johnson present evidence that the facial expressions of singers reflect the pitch height of the notes being sung. The authors provide a number of compelling explanations for this audio-visual mapping that commentator John Ohala expands upon. In the second target article, Huron and Berec differentiate measures of *performance difficulty* from measures of *performance idiomaticism* (how well a passage is suited to a particular instrument). Both the authors and commentator Robert Gjerdingen then explore an intriguing implication of the concept of performance idiomaticism: that symbolic events in music permit *affordances*, much as physical objects do.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, J. (2009). Crossing the boundary: From experimental psychology to ethnomusicology. *Empirical Musicology Review*, 4(2): 82-88
- Becker, J. (2009). Crossing boundaries: An introductory essay. *Empirical Musicology Review*, 4(2): 45-48.
- Clarke, E. (2009). Boundaries, expectations and empirical research: A commentary on Judith Becker’s “crossing boundaries.” *Empirical Musicology Review*, 4(2) 71-74.
- Clayton, M. (2009). Crossing boundaries and bridging gaps: Thoughts on relationships between ethnomusicology and music psychology, *Empirical Musicology Review*, 4(2) 75-77.
- Janata, P. (2009). An entrancing tale of cross-disciplinary bridge building and burning in ethnopsychophysiomusicology. *Empirical Musicology Review*, 4(2) 78-81.
- Penman, J., & Becker, J. (2009). Religious ecstasies, “deep listeners” and musical emotion. *Empirical Musicology Review*, 4(2) 49-70.